

24-5006

District Court No. 1:20-cv-03010-APM

---

IN THE  
United States Court of Appeals  
*for the*  
District of Columbia Circuit

---

In re: BRAD GREENSPAN, on behalf of himself and all others similarly situated  
*Petitioner,*

v.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

*Respondent,*

and

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, STATE OF ARKANSAS, STATE OF  
CALIFORNIA, STATE OF FLORIDA, STATE OF GEORGIA, STATE OF  
INDIANA, COMMONWEALTH OF KENTUCKY, STATE OF LOUISIANA, STATE  
OF MICHIGAN, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI, STATE OF MISSOURI, STATE OF  
MONTANA, STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA, STATE OF TEXAS, AND STATE OF  
WISCONSIN

*Plaintiffs,*

v.

GOOGLE, LLC.

*Defendant.*

STATE OF COLORADO, STATE OF NEBRASKA, STATE OF ARIZONA, STATE  
OF IOWA, STATE OF NEW YORK, STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA, STATE OF  
TENNESSEE, STATE OF UTAH, STATE OF ALASKA, STATE OF  
CONNECTICUT, STATE OF DELAWARE, DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA,  
TERRITORY OF GUAM, STATE OF HAWAII, STATE OF ILLINOIS, STATE OF

KANSAS, STATE OF MAINE, STATE OF MARYLAND, COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS, STATE OF MINNESOTA, STATE OF NEVADA, STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE, STATE OF NEW JERSEY, STATE OF NEW MEXICO, STATE OF NORTH DAKOTA, STATE OF OHIO, STATE OF OKLAHOMA, STATE OF OREGON, COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA, COMMONWEALTH OF PUERTO RICO, STATE OF RHODE ISLAND, STATE OF SOUTH DAKOTA, STATE OF VERMONT, COMMONWEALTH OF VIRGINIA, STATE OF WASHINGTON,

*Real Parties in Interest.*

---

**APPELLANT STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE RAISED**

---

**PRELIMINARY STATEMENT OF ISSUES TO BE RAISED**

Potential issues for consideration on appeal include:

- (1) Whether The Appellant has Title III Standing?
- (2) Whether Ninth Circuit Had Jurisdiction After Notice Appeal Filed By Appellant? Whether when Appellee's Motion For Vexatious Litigant and 1927 lawyer sanctions were filed in District Court a lack of jurisdiction existed?
- (3) Did granted Docket #794 Appellant's Request For Judicial Notice make Appellant Party to the case or what alternative interpretation or plain meaning of a "Party" in Rule 201 of Federal Evidence Rules? On what basis or what evidence or what method did the Court use to compare the topics of the evidence and matters submitted by Appellant did the Court use to determine the matters were not relevant to the ongoing dispute which both pertain to 2007 efforts and tactics of Appellee in its operating its online search engine and advertising business in regards to outside 3<sup>rd</sup> parties including specifically Apple and the largest transaction it publicly announced the same year in 2007, with Myspace.com.

  
Brad Greenspan

244 5th Ave, Suite #G290  
New York, NY 10001  
Email: legalsupport1@nym.hush.com  
*Petitioner Pro Se*

## SUBMISSION OF CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

Pursuant to Fed. R. App. P. 32(a), Appellant makes the following certifications:

1. This brief complies with the type-volume limitation of words for briefs on behalf of Intervenor as it contains 874 words and, thus complies with Fed. R. App. P. 27(d)(2)(A);
2. This brief complies with the typeface requirements of Fed. R. App. P. 32(a)(6), because this brief has been prepared in monospaced typeface using Microsoft Word 2021 in 14 pitch font, Times New Roman Style.

Dated: February 12, 2024

Respectfully submitted,

/s/Brad Greenspan  
Brad Greenspan  
244 5th Avenue, Suite #G290  
New York, NY 10001  
Email: [legalsupport1@nym.hush.com](mailto:legalsupport1@nym.hush.com)  
*Petitioner Pro Se*